

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,021	03/11/2004	Yung Hsiang Wu	CHU 242	3923
7:	590 02/04/2005		EXAMINER	
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.			WONG, STEVEN B	
Suite 500 1101 14 Street, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20005			3711	
			DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/797,021	WU, YUNG HSIANG			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAU INO DATE of this communication com	Steven Wong	3711			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	•			
Disposition of Claims	÷				
4) □ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)					
i) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/797,021 Page 2

Art Unit: 3711

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin (2,731,766) in view of Austin (2,896,372). Regarding claim 1, Rubin discloses a toy comprising a base board (1) having a plurality of cutouts (18) and a plurality of puzzle pieces (3-9) with shapes corresponding to the cutouts. However, Rubin does not provide different images on both sides of the pieces.

Austin reveals a doll including indicia on front and rear sides (Figures 1 and 3, respectively) that is different for indicating different sides of the doll. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the pieces of Rubin with different images on both sides of the pieces in order to show back/front sides or left/right sides of the animals.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, the limitations for the pieces to be positioned "in the order as that of the assembly" and "positioned randomly" have been determined to be related to the intended use and function of the puzzle pieces and not positively define the structure. For example, the order of assembly would relate to the directions provided with the puzzle and not be limited by any structural limitations of the puzzle per se. Therefore, the layout of cutouts provides by Rubin is considered to be positioned in both the order of assembly and be randomly positioned and rotated in various degrees.

Regarding claim 4, note column 1, lines 63-65 of Rubin teaching the use of plastic for the base board. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to also manufacture the pieces from plastic in order to take advantage of that material's well known physical characteristics.

Page 3

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-4416. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 571-272-4415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Wong Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711

SBW February 3, 2005